UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,531	12/03/2003	Eugene M. Lee	113708.130 US1	3192

23400 7590 01/22/2010

POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC
12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE
SUITE 101
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
CORRIELUS, JEAN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/725,531	LEE, EUGENE M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEAN M. CORRIELUS	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 January 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15,16,18-25,27-33,35-41 and 43-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27-33, 35-41 and 43-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request For Continued Examination filed on January 7, 2010, in which claims 1-13, 15-16, 18-25, 27-33, 35-41 and 43-45 are presented for further examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 10, 2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27-33, 35-41 and 43-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims1-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27-33, 35-41 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Copperman et al., (hereinafter "Copperman") US Patent Publication No. 2004/0024739.

As to claim 1, Copperman the claimed

"providing, in the computer system, a first data storage having a group (taxonomies, item 30, fig.1) of a plurality of documents (containers 20 that contains both documents and customers, see fig.1) including at least one document (item 20)";

"accepting, from an input device, a user's selection of a plurality of attributes (user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents, wherein each taxonomy contains a plurality of documents. And, as noted above, the documents may be intellectual property, see [0059] and [0061]) to be associated with a single pre-determined attribute type for the at least one document (the system matches selected elements within each knowledge container, see [0054]), the attribute type having parent and child attribute types, the selected attributes being predetermined and having different parent attributes, attribute types being predetermined and ordered in a predetermined tree-structure hierarchy" (fig.4, [0055], [0059]-[0061]); and

"responsive to the selection of the attributes, automatically tagging (taxonomy tags each element of marked content can contains attribution information that automatically created by auto contextualization, see [0048], [0059]-[0061]) , in the first data storage, the documents in the group including the at least one document, with the selected attributes, and with all attributes of all ancestors but not descendants or siblings according to the hierarchy of the selected attributes; and storing, in a second data storage, respective references in association with the selected

attributes and the ancestor attributes, for later retrieval of individual documents in the group by searching the ancestor attributes instead of the selected attributes, the respective references uniquely indicating respective individual documents in the first data storage (see [0061]-[0062]), wherein the at least one document is a data record including a plurality of fields [see fig.4], wherein the attribute and the attribute type are different from the fields in the document and contents of the fields (fig.4).

(Copperman: paragraph [0059] - paragraph 10061] and paragraph [0154], lines 1-8; In the first reference cited ([0059] - [00611), Copperman clearly discloses a system which stores intellectual property documents which are classified by use of a taxonomy. Surely a system, which stores classified intellectual property, is an 'intellectual property classification system'. The second reference cited clearly discloses the user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents. As noted above, the documents can include intellectual property documents.).

As to claim 2, Copperman discloses the claimed "wherein providing the group of documents included in the group of document responsive to a user" (Copperman: paragraph [0008], lines 9-12 and paragraph [00751 and paragraph [0141], lines 1-5);

As to claims 3-4, Copperman discloses the claimed "organizing the group of documents, wherein the documents are sorted for visual presentation by at least one field therein, wherein the at least one field is different from the attribute and attribute type associated therewith"

(Copperman: paragraph [0008], lines 9-12 and paragraph [0075] and paragraph [0141], lines 1-5).

As to claim 5, Copperman discloses "assigning at least one of documents to at least one other group" (Copperman: paragraph 10059] - paragraph [0061] and paragraph [0154], lines 1-8; See rejection of claim 14for further comments on these references.)

As to claim 6, Copperman discloses, "wherein the document is xml format or video format" ([0065]).

As to claim 7, Copperman discloses "searching the second data storage for document based on criteria including the attribute and attribute type, and using the respective references in the second data storage to locate the documents in the first data storage" (Copperman: paragraph 101541, lines 1-8; Note the user first a natural language query in addition to selecting specific classifications or taxonomies. The natural language query may contain keywords different from the words on the generated list.)

As to claim 8, Copperman discloses "retrieving the located documents from the first storage based on the respective references" (Copperman: paragraph I0154], lines 1-9 and paragraph I0162] and paragraph I0128]).

As to claim 9, Copperman discloses "displaying information characterizing the documents" (Copperman: paragraph 10155] and paragraph 10156], lines 3-5).

As claim 10-11, Copperman discloses "a reference to a URL" ([0066}]).

As to claims 12-13, in the first reference cited ([0059] - [00611), Copperman clearly discloses a system which stores intellectual property documents which are classified by use of a taxonomy. Surely a system, which stores classified intellectual property, is an 'intellectual property classification system'. The second reference cited clearly discloses the user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents. As noted above, the documents can include intellectual property documents.).

As to claims 15-16, Copperman discloses "wherein the attribute are selected from a plurality of attribute types" (Copperman: paragraph I0059] - [0061]).

As to claims18-20, Copperman discloses the claimed "exporting the tree structure hierarchy including the attributes and the attribute types" (see fig.4), and (Copperman: paragraph [01561, lines 3-5; Note specifically that the search engine 'returns documents' to a user.)

As to claim 21, Copperman discloses "wherein the respective references correspond to the serial numbers of the respective documents" ([0073]]).

As to claim 22, Copperman discloses the claimed

"providing, in the computer system, a first data storage having a group (taxonomies, item 30, fig.1) of a plurality of documents (containers 20 that contains both documents and customers, see fig.1) including at least one document (item 20)";

"accepting, from an input device, a user's selection of a plurality of attributes (user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents, wherein each taxonomy contains a plurality of documents. And, as noted above, the documents may be intellectual property, see [0059] and [0061]) to be associated with a single pre-determined attribute type for the at least one document (the system matches selected elements within each knowledge container, see [0054]), the attribute type having parent and child attribute types, the selected attributes being predetermined and having different parent attributes, attribute types being predetermined and ordered in a predetermined tree-structure hierarchy" (fig.4, [0055], [0059]-[0061]); and

"responsive to the selection of the attributes, automatically tagging (taxonomy tags each element of marked content can contains attribution information that automatically created by auto contextualization, see [0048], [0059]-[0061]) , in the first data storage, the documents in the group including the at least one document, with the selected attributes, and with all attributes of all ancestors but not descendants or siblings according to the hierarchy of the selected attributes; and storing, in a second data storage, respective references in association with the selected attributes and the ancestor attributes, for later retrieval of individual documents in the group by searching the ancestor attributes instead of the selected attributes, the respective references uniquely indicating respective individual documents in the first data storage (see [0061]-[0062]),

wherein the at least one document is a data record including a plurality of fields [see fig.4], wherein the attribute and the attribute type are different from the fields in the document and contents of the fields (fig.4); and "wherein the at least one document and the at least one other document are representative of at least one of: an invention disclosure document, a patent document, a trademark document, a copyright document, a product description document, a contract document, a license document, a sui generis protection document, a design registration document, a trade secret document, and an opinion document" (Copperman: paragraph 00591 - paragraph 00611] and paragraph [0154], lines 1-8; In the first reference cited ([0059] - [00611), Copperman clearly discloses a system which stores intellectual property documents which are classified by use of a taxonomy. Surely a system, which stores classified intellectual property, is an 'intellectual property classification system'. The second reference cited clearly discloses the user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents. As noted above, the documents can include intellectual property documents.).

In addition, Copperman discloses the claimed "wherein the at least one document is a data record including a plurality of fields [see fig.4 [0122], and wherein the attribute and the attribute type are different from the fields in the document and contents of the fields (fig.4).

As to claims 23-25 and 27-29, the limitations of claims 23-25 and 27-29 have been mentioned in the rejection of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 30, Copperman discloses the claimed:

"at least a computer readable medium [0037]" comprising instructions [0035]-[0036] for:

"providing, in the computer system, a first data storage having a group (taxonomies, item 30, fig.1) of a plurality of documents (containers 20 that contains both documents and customers, see fig.1) including at least one document (item 20)";

"accepting, from an input device, a user's selection of a plurality of attributes (user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents, wherein each taxonomy contains a plurality of documents. And, as noted above, the documents may be intellectual property, see [0059] and [0061]) to be associated with a single pre-determined attribute type for the at least one document (the system matches selected elements within each knowledge container, see [0054]), the attribute type having parent and child attribute types, the selected attributes being predetermined and having different parent attributes, attribute types being predetermined and ordered in a predetermined tree-structure hierarchy" (fig.4, [0055], [0059]-[0061]); and

"responsive to the selection of the attributes, automatically tagging (taxonomy tags each element of marked content can contains attribution information that automatically created by auto contextualization, see [0048], [0059]-[0061]) , in the first data storage, the documents in the group including the at least one document, with the selected attributes, and with all attributes of all ancestors but not descendants or siblings according to the hierarchy of the selected attributes; and storing, in a second data storage, respective references in association with the selected attributes and the ancestor attributes, for later retrieval of individual documents in the group by

searching the ancestor attributes instead of the selected attributes, the respective references uniquely indicating respective individual documents in the first data storage (see [0061]-[0062]),

"wherein the at least one document and the at least one other document are representative of at least one of: an invention disclosure document, a patent document, a trademark document, a copyright document, a product description document, a contract document, a license document, a sui generis protection document, a design registration document, a trade secret document, and an opinion document" (Copperman: paragraph I00591 - paragraph 10061] and paragraph [0154], lines 1-8; In the first reference cited ([0059] - [00611), Copperman clearly discloses a system which stores intellectual property documents which are classified by use of a taxonomy. Surely a system, which stores classified intellectual property, is an 'intellectual property classification system'. The second reference cited clearly discloses the user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents. As noted above, the documents can include intellectual property documents.). In addition, Copperman discloses the claimed "wherein the at least one document is a data record including a plurality of fields [see fig.4 [0122], and wherein the attribute and the attribute type are different from the fields in the document and contents of the fields (fig.4).

As to claims 31-33 and 35-37:

Claims 31-35 and 35-37 are computer program product comprising instructions for performing the method of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 above. They are rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 38, Copperman discloses the claimed:

"means, in the at least one computer system, for providing, in the computer system, a first data storage having a group (taxonomies, item 30, fig.1) of a plurality of documents (containers 20 that contains both documents and customers, see fig.1) including at least one document (item 20)";

"accepting, from an input device, a user's selection of a plurality of attributes (user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents, wherein each taxonomy contains a plurality of documents. And, as noted above, the documents may be intellectual property, see [0059] and [0061]) to be associated with a single pre-determined attribute type for the at least one document (the system matches selected elements within each knowledge container, see [0054]), the attribute type having parent and child attribute types, the selected attributes being predetermined and having different parent attributes, attribute types being predetermined and ordered in a predetermined tree-structure hierarchy" (fig.4, [0055], [0059]-[0061]); and

"responsive to the selection of the attributes, automatically tagging (taxonomy tags each element of marked content can contains attribution information that automatically created by auto contextualization, see [0048], [0059]-[0061]) , in the first data storage, the documents in the group including the at least one document, with the selected attributes, and with all attributes of all ancestors but not descendants or siblings according to the hierarchy of the selected attributes; and storing, in a second data storage, respective references in association with the selected attributes and the ancestor attributes, for later retrieval of individual documents in the group by

searching the ancestor attributes instead of the selected attributes, the respective references uniquely indicating respective individual documents in the first data storage (see [0061]-[0062]),

"wherein the at least one document and the at least one other document are representative of at least one of: an invention disclosure document, a patent document, a trademark document, a copyright document, a product description document, a contract document, a license document, a sui generis protection document, a design registration document, a trade secret document, and an opinion document" (Copperman: paragraph 00591 - paragraph 00611 and paragraph [0154], lines 1-8; In the first reference cited ([0059] - [0061]), Copperman clearly discloses a system which stores intellectual property documents which are classified by use of a taxonomy. Surely a system, which stores classified intellectual property, is an 'intellectual property classification system'. The second reference cited clearly discloses the user selecting specific classifications (taxonomies and concept nodes) of documents. As noted above, the documents can include intellectual property documents.).

As to claims 38-41 and 43-45:

Claims 38-41 and 43-45 are system for performing the method of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 above. They are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEAN M. CORRIELUS whose telephone number is (571)272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jean M Corrielus/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

January 21, 2010